

REMARKSRegarding the Status of the Claims:

Claims 24, 26, 30, 31, 34, 41 and 43 are pending.

Claims 1 – 23, 25, 27 – 29, 32 – 33, 35 – 40, 42 are canceled.

No claims have been withdrawn from consideration.

Regarding the Claim Rejections:

The Office action presents thirty-three rejections, which rely on overlapping combinations of the following eleven references:

1. US 5,747,568 to Fischer et al. (hereinafter, “Fischer”);
2. WO 96/09928 to Sallmetall (hereinafter, “Sallmetall”);
3. US 5,821,302 to Rosenau et al. (hereinafter, “Rosenau”);
4. US 5,985,079 to Ellison (hereinafter, “Ellison”);
5. US 5,318,737 to Trabert et al. (hereinafter, “Trabert”);
6. EP 006421 to Endoh (hereinafter, “Endoh”);
7. US 5,858,550 to Tsai et al. (hereinafter, “Tsai”);
8. US 5,306,548 to Zabrocki et al. (hereinafter, “Zabrocki”);
9. US 4,169,180 to McDonagh (hereinafter, “McDonagh”);
10. US 5,900,446 to Nishihara (hereinafter, “Nishihara”); and
11. US 4,204,047 to Margotte et al. (hereinafter, “Margotte”).

Citing 35 U.S.C §103(a), the Office action rejects:

1. claims 24, 31, and 41 over Fischer, Sallmetall, Rosenau, and Nishihara;
2. claims 24, 31, and 41 over Fischer, Sallmetall, Rosenau, and Margotte
3. claims 24, 31, 34, and 41 over Fischer, Ellison, Rosenau, and Nishihara;
4. claims 24, 31, 34, and 41 over Fischer, Ellison, Rosenau, and Margotte;
5. claims 24, 31, and 41 over Rosenau, Ellison, and Margotte;
6. claims 24 and 31 over Rosenau, Trabert, and Margotte;

7. claims 24, 31, and 41 over Rosenau, Endoh, and Margotte;
8. claims 24, 31, and 41 over Fischer, Endoh, Rosenau, and Nishihara;
9. claims 24, 31, and 41 over Fischer, Endoh, Rosenau, and Margotte;
10. claim 30 over Fischer, Sallmetall, Rosenau, and Margotte;
11. claim 30 over Fischer, Sallmetall, Rosenau, and Nishihara;
12. claim 30 over Fischer, Ellison, Rosenau, and Margotte;
13. claim 30 over Fischer, Ellison, Rosenau, and Nishihara;
14. claim 30 over Rosenau, Ellison and Margotte;
15. claim 30 over Rosenau, Trabert, and Margotte;
16. claim 30 over Rosenau, Endoh, and Margotte;
17. claim 30 over Fischer, Endoh, Rosenau, Tsai, and Margotte;
18. claim 30 over Fischer, Endoh, Rosenau, Tsai, and Nishihara;
19. claim 26 over Fischer, Rosenau, and Margotte;
20. claim 26 over Fischer, Rosenau, and Nishihara;
21. claim 26 over Fischer, Ellison, Rosenau, and Margotte;
22. claim 26 over Fischer, Ellison, Rosenau, and Nishihara;
23. claim 26 over Rosenau, Ellison, and Margotte,
24. claim 26 over Rosenau, Trabert, and Margotte;
25. claim 26 over Rosenau, Endoh, and Margotte;
26. claim 26 over Fischer, Endoh, Rosenau, and Margotte;
27. claim 26 over Fischer, Endoh, Rosenau, and Nishihara;
28. claim 43 over Fischer, Zabrocki, Rosenau, and Nishihara;
29. claim 43 over Fischer, Zabrocki, Rosenau, and Margotte;
30. claim 43 over Fischer, McDonagh, Rosenau, and Nishihara;
31. claim 43 over Fischer, McDonagh, Rosenau, and Margotte;
32. claim 43 over Rosenau, Zabrocki, and Margotte; and
33. claim 43 over Rosenau, McDonagh, and Margotte.

Regarding Rejection 1:

Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of claims 24, 31, and 41 over Fischer, Sallmetall, Rosenau, and Nishihara should be withdrawn.

The Office action asserts that Nishihara “teaches a composition comprising a core/shell graft copolymer compounded with polycarbonate.”¹ According to the Office action, it would have been obvious to compound a core/shell graft copolymer with 10 – 90 parts by weight of polycarbonate based on the teachings of these references in order “to improve the compositions processability, high impact resistance, and rigidity.”²

Applicants respectfully disagree, because Nishihara relates to combining polycarbonate with a graft copolymer in which the graft base does not comprise any crosslinking agents. Nishihara discloses that the graft polymers are rubber-modified styrene polymers. Column 7, lines 1 to 39 of Nishihara provides examples of suitable rubbery polymers, including diene rubbers, e.g., polybutadiene, poly(styrene-butadiene) and poly(acrylonitrile-butadiene). Nishihara does not relate to graft copolymers in which the graft base comprises crosslinking agents.

On the other hand, the present claims require a polycarbonate to be coextruded with a graft copolymer, having a graft base which comprises at least 0.1% by weight of crosslinking agents. Since Nishihara does not disclose combining polycarbonate with a graft copolymer with a graft base comprising crosslinking agents, a person having ordinary skill in the art would not combine the cited references to arrive at the present invention.

Applicants also respectfully reassert the arguments previously presented regarding whether a person of ordinary skill in the art would have found the combination of the other cited references obvious.

Regarding Rejection 2:

Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of claims 24, 31, and 41 over Fischer, Sallmetall, Rosenau, and Margotte should be withdrawn.

The Office action asserts that Margotte “teaches a composition comprising a

¹ Page 3, lines 21 – 22 of the non-final Office action mailed June 23, 2008.

² Page 4, lines 10 – 11 of the non-final Office action mailed June 23, 2008.

core/shell graft copolymer compounded with polycarbonate.”³ According to the Office action, it would have been obvious to compound a core/shell graft copolymer with 10 – 90 parts by weight of polycarbonate based on the teachings of these references in order “to improve the compositions processability, high impact resistance, and rigidity.”⁴

Applicants respectfully disagree, because Margotte relates to combining polycarbonate with a graft copolymer in which the graft base does not comprise any crosslinking agents. According to Column 4, lines 7 to 29 of Margote, suitable rubbers are polybutadiene, butadiene/styrene copolymers, copolymers or butadiene and acrylonitrile, copolymers of butadiene and a lower alkylester of acrylic or methacrylic acid. Margotte does not relate to graft copolymers in which the graft base comprises crosslinking agents.

On the other hand, the present claims require a polycarbonate to be coextruded with a graft copolymer, having a graft base which comprises at least 0.1% by weight of crosslinking agents. Since Margotte does not disclose combining polycarbonate with a graft copolymer with a graft base comprising crosslinking agents, a person having ordinary skill in the art would not combine the cited references to arrive at the present invention.

Applicants also respectfully reassert the arguments previously presented regarding whether a person of ordinary skill in the art would have found the combination of the other cited references obvious.

Regarding Rejection 3:

Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of claims 24, 31, 34, and 41 over Fischer, Ellison, Rosenau, and Nishihara should be withdrawn. As discussed above, the present claims require a polycarbonate to be coextruded with a graft copolymer, having a graft base which comprises at least 0.1% by weight of crosslinking agents. Since Nishihara does not disclose combining polycarbonate with a graft copolymer with a graft base comprising crosslinking agents, a person having ordinary skill in the art would not combine the cited references to arrive at the present invention. Applicants also

³ Page 3, lines 21 – 22 of the non-final Office action mailed June 23, 2008.

⁴ Page 4, lines 10 – 11 of the non-final Office action mailed June 23, 2008.

respectfully reassert the arguments previously presented regarding whether a person of ordinary skill in the art would have found the combination of the other cited references obvious.

Regarding Rejection 4:

Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of claims 24, 31, 34, and 41 over Fischer, Ellison, Rosenau, and Margotte should be withdrawn. As discussed above, the present claims require a polycarbonate to be coextruded with a graft copolymer, having a graft base which comprises at least 0.1% by weight of crosslinking agents. Since Margotte does not disclose combining polycarbonate with a graft copolymer with a graft base comprising crosslinking agents, a person having ordinary skill in the art would not combine the cited references to arrive at the present invention. Applicants also respectfully reassert the arguments previously presented regarding whether a person of ordinary skill in the art would have found the combination of the other cited references obvious.

Regarding Rejection 5:

Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of claims 24, 31, and 41 over Rosenau, Ellison, and Margotte should be withdrawn. As discussed above, the present claims require a polycarbonate to be coextruded with a graft copolymer, having a graft base which comprises at least 0.1% by weight of crosslinking agents. Since Margotte does not disclose combining polycarbonate with a graft copolymer with a graft base comprising crosslinking agents, a person having ordinary skill in the art would not combine the cited references to arrive at the present invention.

Regarding Rejection 6:

Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of claims 24 and 31 over Rosenau, Trabert, and Margotte should be withdrawn. As discussed above, the present claims require a polycarbonate to be coextruded with a graft copolymer, having a graft base which comprises at least 0.1% by weight of crosslinking agents. Since Margotte

does not disclose combining polycarbonate with a graft copolymer with a graft base comprising crosslinking agents, a person having ordinary skill in the art would not combine the cited references to arrive at the present invention. Applicants also respectfully reassert the arguments previously presented regarding whether a person of ordinary skill in the art would have found the combination of the other cited references obvious.

Regarding Rejection 7:

Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of claims 24, 31, and 41 over Rosenau, Endoh, and Margotte should be withdrawn. As discussed above, the present claims require a polycarbonate to be coextruded with a graft copolymer, having a graft base which comprises at least 0.1% by weight of crosslinking agents. Since Margotte does not disclose combining polycarbonate with a graft copolymer with a graft base comprising crosslinking agents, a person having ordinary skill in the art would not combine the cited references to arrive at the present invention. Applicants also respectfully reassert the arguments previously presented regarding whether a person of ordinary skill in the art would have found the combination of the other cited references obvious.

Regarding Rejection 8:

Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of claims 24, 31, and 41 over Fischer, Endoh, Rosenau, and Nishihara should be withdrawn. As discussed above, the present claims require a polycarbonate to be coextruded with a graft copolymer, having a graft base which comprises at least 0.1% by weight of crosslinking agents. Since Nishihara does not disclose combining polycarbonate with a graft copolymer with a graft base comprising crosslinking agents, a person having ordinary skill in the art would not combine the cited references to arrive at the present invention. Applicants also respectfully reassert the arguments previously presented regarding whether a person of ordinary skill in the art would have found the combination of the other cited references obvious.

Regarding Rejection 9:

Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of claims 24, 31, and 41 over Fischer, Endoh, Rosenau, and Margotte should be withdrawn. As discussed above, the present claims require a polycarbonate to be coextruded with a graft copolymer, having a graft base which comprises at least 0.1% by weight of crosslinking agents. Since Margotte does not disclose combining polycarbonate with a graft copolymer with a graft base comprising crosslinking agents, a person having ordinary skill in the art would not combine the cited references to arrive at the present invention. Applicants also respectfully reassert the arguments previously presented regarding whether a person of ordinary skill in the art would have found the combination of the other cited references obvious.

Regarding Rejection 10:

Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of claims 30 over Fischer, Sallmetall, Rosenau, and Margotte should be withdrawn. As discussed above, the present claims require a polycarbonate to be coextruded with a graft copolymer, having a graft base which comprises at least 0.1% by weight of crosslinking agents. Since Margotte does not disclose combining polycarbonate with a graft copolymer with a graft base comprising crosslinking agents, a person having ordinary skill in the art would not combine the cited references to arrive at the present invention. Applicants also respectfully reassert the arguments previously presented regarding whether a person of ordinary skill in the art would have found the combination of the other cited references obvious.

Regarding Rejection 11:

Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of claims 30 over Fischer, Sallmetall, Rosenau, and Nishihara should be withdrawn. As discussed above, the present claims require a polycarbonate to be coextruded with a graft copolymer, having a graft base which comprises at least 0.1% by weight of crosslinking agents. Since

Nishihara does not disclose combining polycarbonate with a graft copolymer with a graft base comprising crosslinking agents, a person having ordinary skill in the art would not combine the cited references to arrive at the present invention. Applicants also respectfully reassert the arguments previously presented regarding whether a person of ordinary skill in the art would have found the combination of the other cited references obvious.

Regarding Rejection 12:

Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of claims 30 over Fischer, Ellison, Rosenau, and Margotte should be withdrawn. As discussed above, the present claims require a polycarbonate to be coextruded with a graft copolymer, having a graft base which comprises at least 0.1% by weight of crosslinking agents. Since Margotte does not disclose combining polycarbonate with a graft copolymer with a graft base comprising crosslinking agents, a person having ordinary skill in the art would not combine the cited references to arrive at the present invention. Applicants also respectfully reassert the arguments previously presented regarding whether a person of ordinary skill in the art would have found the combination of the other cited references obvious.

Regarding Rejection 13:

Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of claims 30 over Fischer, Ellison, Rosenau, and Nishihara should be withdrawn. As discussed above, the present claims require a polycarbonate to be coextruded with a graft copolymer, having a graft base which comprises at least 0.1% by weight of crosslinking agents. Since Nishihara does not disclose combining polycarbonate with a graft copolymer with a graft base comprising crosslinking agents, a person having ordinary skill in the art would not combine the cited references to arrive at the present invention. Applicants also respectfully reassert the arguments previously presented regarding whether a person of ordinary skill in the art would have found the combination of the other cited references obvious.

Regarding Rejection 14:

Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of claims 30 over Rosenau, Ellison and Margotte should be withdrawn. As discussed above, the present claims require a polycarbonate to be coextruded with a graft copolymer, having a graft base which comprises at least 0.1% by weight of crosslinking agents. Since Margotte does not disclose combining polycarbonate with a graft copolymer with a graft base comprising crosslinking agents, a person having ordinary skill in the art would not combine the cited references to arrive at the present invention. Applicants also respectfully reassert the arguments previously presented regarding whether a person of ordinary skill in the art would have found the combination of the other cited references obvious.

Regarding Rejection 15:

Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of claims 30 over Rosenau, Trabert, and Margotte should be withdrawn. As discussed above, the present claims require a polycarbonate to be coextruded with a graft copolymer, having a graft base which comprises at least 0.1% by weight of crosslinking agents. Since Margotte does not disclose combining polycarbonate with a graft copolymer with a graft base comprising crosslinking agents, a person having ordinary skill in the art would not combine the cited references to arrive at the present invention. Applicants also respectfully reassert the arguments previously presented regarding whether a person of ordinary skill in the art would have found the combination of the other cited references obvious.

Regarding Rejection 16:

Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of claims 30 over Rosenau, Endoh, and Margotte should be withdrawn. As discussed above, the present claims require a polycarbonate to be coextruded with a graft copolymer, having a graft base which comprises at least 0.1% by weight of crosslinking agents. Since Margotte does not disclose combining polycarbonate with a graft copolymer with a graft base comprising crosslinking agents, a person having ordinary skill in the art would not combine the cited

references to arrive at the present invention. Applicants also respectfully reassert the arguments previously presented regarding whether a person of ordinary skill in the art would have found the combination of the other cited references obvious.

Regarding Rejection 17:

Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of claims 30 over Fischer, Endoh, Rosenau, Tsai, and Margotte should be withdrawn. As discussed above, the present claims require a polycarbonate to be coextruded with a graft copolymer, having a graft base which comprises at least 0.1% by weight of crosslinking agents. Since Margotte does not disclose combining polycarbonate with a graft copolymer with a graft base comprising crosslinking agents, a person having ordinary skill in the art would not combine the cited references to arrive at the present invention. Applicants also respectfully reassert the arguments previously presented regarding whether a person of ordinary skill in the art would have found the combination of the other cited references obvious.

Regarding Rejection 18:

Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of claims 30 over Fischer, Endoh, Rosenau, Tsai, and Nishihara should be withdrawn. As discussed above, the present claims require a polycarbonate to be coextruded with a graft copolymer, having a graft base which comprises at least 0.1% by weight of crosslinking agents. Since Nishihara does not disclose combining polycarbonate with a graft copolymer with a graft base comprising crosslinking agents, a person having ordinary skill in the art would not combine the cited references to arrive at the present invention. Applicants also respectfully reassert the arguments previously presented regarding whether a person of ordinary skill in the art would have found the combination of the other cited references obvious.

Regarding Rejection 19:

Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of claims 26 over Fischer, Rosenau, and Margotte should be withdrawn. As discussed above, the present claims require a polycarbonate to be coextruded with a graft copolymer, having a graft base which comprises at least 0.1% by weight of crosslinking agents. Since Margotte does not disclose combining polycarbonate with a graft copolymer with a graft base comprising crosslinking agents, a person having ordinary skill in the art would not combine the cited references to arrive at the present invention. Applicants also respectfully reassert the arguments previously presented regarding whether a person of ordinary skill in the art would have found the combination of the other cited references obvious.

Regarding Rejection 20:

Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of claims 26 over Fischer, Rosenau, and Nishihara should be withdrawn. As discussed above, the present claims require a polycarbonate to be coextruded with a graft copolymer, having a graft base which comprises at least 0.1% by weight of crosslinking agents. Since Nishihara does not disclose combining polycarbonate with a graft copolymer with a graft base comprising crosslinking agents, a person having ordinary skill in the art would not combine the cited references to arrive at the present invention. Applicants also respectfully reassert the arguments previously presented regarding whether a person of ordinary skill in the art would have found the combination of the other cited references obvious.

Regarding Rejection 21:

Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of claims 26 over Fischer, Ellison, Rosenau, and Margotte should be withdrawn. As discussed above, the present claims require a polycarbonate to be coextruded with a graft copolymer, having a graft base which comprises at least 0.1% by weight of crosslinking agents. Since Margotte does not disclose combining polycarbonate with a graft copolymer with a graft base comprising crosslinking agents, a person having ordinary skill in the art would not

combine the cited references to arrive at the present invention. Applicants also respectfully reassert the arguments previously presented regarding whether a person of ordinary skill in the art would have found the combination of the other cited references obvious.

Regarding Rejection 22:

Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of claims 26 over Fischer, Ellison, Rosenau, and Nishihara should be withdrawn. As discussed above, the present claims require a polycarbonate to be coextruded with a graft copolymer, having a graft base which comprises at least 0.1% by weight of crosslinking agents. Since Nishihara does not disclose combining polycarbonate with a graft copolymer with a graft base comprising crosslinking agents, a person having ordinary skill in the art would not combine the cited references to arrive at the present invention. Applicants also respectfully reassert the arguments previously presented regarding whether a person of ordinary skill in the art would have found the combination of the other cited references obvious.

Regarding Rejection 23:

Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of claims 26 over Rosenau, Ellison, and Margotte should be withdrawn. As discussed above, the present claims require a polycarbonate to be coextruded with a graft copolymer, having a graft base which comprises at least 0.1% by weight of crosslinking agents. Since Margotte does not disclose combining polycarbonate with a graft copolymer with a graft base comprising crosslinking agents, a person having ordinary skill in the art would not combine the cited references to arrive at the present invention. Applicants also respectfully reassert the arguments previously presented regarding whether a person of ordinary skill in the art would have found the combination of the other cited references obvious.

Regarding Rejection 24:

Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of claims 26 over Rosenau, Trabert, and Margotte should be withdrawn. As discussed above, the present claims require a polycarbonate to be coextruded with a graft copolymer, having a graft base which comprises at least 0.1% by weight of crosslinking agents. Since Margotte does not disclose combining polycarbonate with a graft copolymer with a graft base comprising crosslinking agents, a person having ordinary skill in the art would not combine the cited references to arrive at the present invention. Applicants also respectfully reassert the arguments previously presented regarding whether a person of ordinary skill in the art would have found the combination of the other cited references obvious.

Regarding Rejection 25:

Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of claims 26 over Rosenau, Endoh, and Margotte should be withdrawn. As discussed above, the present claims require a polycarbonate to be coextruded with a graft copolymer, having a graft base which comprises at least 0.1% by weight of crosslinking agents. Since Margotte does not disclose combining polycarbonate with a graft copolymer with a graft base comprising crosslinking agents, a person having ordinary skill in the art would not combine the cited references to arrive at the present invention. Applicants also respectfully reassert the arguments previously presented regarding whether a person of ordinary skill in the art would have found the combination of the other cited references obvious.

Regarding Rejection 26:

Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of claims 26 over Fischer, Endoh, Rosenau, and Margotte should be withdrawn. As discussed above, the present claims require a polycarbonate to be coextruded with a graft copolymer, having a graft base which comprises at least 0.1% by weight of crosslinking agents. Since Margotte does not disclose combining polycarbonate with a graft copolymer with a graft base comprising crosslinking agents, a person having ordinary skill in the art would not combine the cited references to arrive at the present invention. Applicants also

respectfully reassert the arguments previously presented regarding whether a person of ordinary skill in the art would have found the combination of the other cited references obvious.

Regarding Rejection 27:

Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of claims 26 over Fischer, Endoh, Rosenau, and Nishihara should be withdrawn. As discussed above, the present claims require a polycarbonate to be coextruded with a graft copolymer, having a graft base which comprises at least 0.1% by weight of crosslinking agents. Since Nishihara does not disclose combining polycarbonate with a graft copolymer with a graft base comprising crosslinking agents, a person having ordinary skill in the art would not combine the cited references to arrive at the present invention. Applicants also respectfully reassert the arguments previously presented regarding whether a person of ordinary skill in the art would have found the combination of the other cited references obvious.

Regarding Rejection 28:

Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of claims 43 over Fischer, Zabrocki, Rosenau, and Nishihara should be withdrawn. As discussed above, the present claims require a polycarbonate to be coextruded with a graft copolymer, having a graft base which comprises at least 0.1% by weight of crosslinking agents. Since Nishihara does not disclose combining polycarbonate with a graft copolymer with a graft base comprising crosslinking agents, a person having ordinary skill in the art would not combine the cited references to arrive at the present invention. Applicants also respectfully reassert the arguments previously presented regarding whether a person of ordinary skill in the art would have found the combination of the other cited references obvious.

Regarding Rejection 29:

Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of claims 43 over Fischer, Zabrocki, Rosenau, and Margotte should be withdrawn. As discussed above, the present claims require a polycarbonate to be coextruded with a graft copolymer, having a graft base which comprises at least 0.1% by weight of crosslinking agents. Since Margotte does not disclose combining polycarbonate with a graft copolymer with a graft base comprising crosslinking agents, a person having ordinary skill in the art would not combine the cited references to arrive at the present invention. Applicants also respectfully reassert the arguments previously presented regarding whether a person of ordinary skill in the art would have found the combination of the other cited references obvious.

Regarding Rejection 30:

Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of claims 43 over Fischer, McDonagh, Rosenau, and Nishihara should be withdrawn. As discussed above, the present claims require a polycarbonate to be coextruded with a graft copolymer, having a graft base which comprises at least 0.1% by weight of crosslinking agents. Since Nishihara does not disclose combining polycarbonate with a graft copolymer with a graft base comprising crosslinking agents, a person having ordinary skill in the art would not combine the cited references to arrive at the present invention. Applicants also respectfully reassert the arguments previously presented regarding whether a person of ordinary skill in the art would have found the combination of the other cited references obvious.

Regarding Rejection 31:

Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of claims 43 over Fischer, McDonagh, Rosenau, and Margotte should be withdrawn. As discussed above, the present claims require a polycarbonate to be coextruded with a graft copolymer, having a graft base which comprises at least 0.1% by weight of crosslinking agents. Since Margotte does not disclose combining polycarbonate with a graft copolymer with a graft

base comprising crosslinking agents, a person having ordinary skill in the art would not combine the cited references to arrive at the present invention. Applicants also respectfully reassert the arguments previously presented regarding whether a person of ordinary skill in the art would have found the combination of the other cited references obvious.

Regarding Rejection 32:

Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of claims 43 over Rosenau, Zabrocki, and Margotte should be withdrawn. As discussed above, the present claims require a polycarbonate to be coextruded with a graft copolymer, having a graft base which comprises at least 0.1% by weight of crosslinking agents. Since Margotte does not disclose combining polycarbonate with a graft copolymer with a graft base comprising crosslinking agents, a person having ordinary skill in the art would not combine the cited references to arrive at the present invention. Applicants also respectfully reassert the arguments previously presented regarding whether a person of ordinary skill in the art would have found the combination of the other cited references obvious.

Regarding Rejection 33:

Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection of claims 43 over Rosenau, McDonagh, and Margotte. As discussed above, the present claims require a polycarbonate to be coextruded with a graft copolymer, having a graft base which comprises at least 0.1% by weight of crosslinking agents. Since Margotte does not disclose combining polycarbonate with a graft copolymer with a graft base comprising crosslinking agents, a person having ordinary skill in the art would not combine the cited references to arrive at the present invention. Applicants also respectfully reassert the arguments previously presented regarding whether a person of ordinary skill in the art would have found the combination of the other cited references obvious.

In Conclusion:

The present application is in condition for allowance. Applicants request favorable action in this matter. In order to facilitate the resolution of any issues or questions presented by this paper, the Examiner is welcome to contact the undersigned by phone to further the discussion.

NOVAK DRUCE + QUIGG, LLP
1300 Eye St. N.W.
Suite 1000 West
Washington, D.C. 20005

Phone: (202) 659-0100
Fax: (202) 659-0105

Respectfully submitted,
NOVAK DRUCE + QUIGG, LLP



Michael P. Byrne
Registration No. 54,015